UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/585,904	05/07/2007	Royce McKim	RM030	4097	
25784 MICHAEL O. S	7590 07/09/201 [.] SCHEINBERG	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 1641	40	HWU, DAVIS D			
AUSTIN, TX 78716-4140			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3752		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/09/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/585,904	MCKIM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Davis Hwu	3752	

	BavioTiva	0702
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 June 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection filed after a filed afte	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected ciaims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		i pe entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No I sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered it or other evidence is necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application ir	condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/Davis Hwu/	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 3752

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While the examiner agrees that a sheet being rolled up is structurely different from the roll being folded as recited, he must consider the overall result of the two arrangements. The prior art, having the sheet rolled, still disperses the agent uniformly over the target area as would be the case if the sheet was folded instead of being rolled up. Therefore, despite the difference of the sheet being rolled up verses being folded, the end result is the same and thus, the instant invention is not deemed to patantably distinct from the prior art at this stage.